Astronomy & Astrophysics manuscript no. paper161˙arxiv
February 23, 2017
© ESO 2017

arXiv:1701.02629v2 [astro-ph.GA] 22 Feb 2017

Letter to the Editor

Hot Stuff for One Year (HSOY)

A 580 million star proper motion catalog derived from Gaia DR1 and PPMXL

M. Altmann[1], S. Roeser[1,2], M. Demleitner[1], U. Bastian[1], and E. Schilbach[1,2]

[1] Zentrum für Astronomie der Universität Heidelberg, Astronomisches Rechen-Institut, Mönchhofstr. 12-14, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany e-mail: maltmann@ari.uni-heidelberg.de
[2] Zentrum für Astronomie der Universität Heidelberg, Landessternwarte Königsstuhl, Königsstuhl 12, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany

Received January 04, 2017, accepted xxx

ABSTRACT

Context. Recently, the first installment of data from ESA's Gaia astrometric satellite mission (Gaia DR1) was released, containing positions of more than 1 billion stars with unprecedented precision, as well as proper motions and parallaxes, however only for a subset of 2 million objects. The second release will include those quantities for most objects.
Aims. In order to provide a dataset that bridges the time gap between the Gaia DR1 and Gaia DR2 releases and partly remedies the lack of proper motions in the former, HSOY ("**H**ot **S**tuff for **O**ne **Y**ear") was created as a hybrid catalog between Gaia and ground-based astrometry, featuring proper motions (but no parallaxes) for a large fraction of the DR1 objects. While not attempting to compete with future Gaia releases in terms of data quality or number of objects, the aim of HSOY is to provide improved proper motions partly based on Gaia data, allowing studies to be carried out just now or as pilot studies for later projects requiring higher-precision data.
Methods. The HSOY catalog was compiled using the positions taken from Gaia DR1 combined with the input data from the PPMXL catalog, employing the same weighted least-squares technique that was used to assemble the PPMXL catalog itself.
Results. This effort resulted in a four-parameter astrometric catalog containing 583 million stars, with Gaia DR1 quality positions and proper motions with precisions from far less than 1 mas/yr to 5 mas/yr, depending on object brightness and location on the sky.

Key words. astrometry – catalogs – Galaxy: kinematics and dynamics – proper motions

1. Introduction

Gaia, ESA's 1-billion star astrometric space mission (Gaia Collaboration , 2016a) set out in late 2013 to revolutionise (among many other fields of astronomy) our understanding of the kinematics, the structure and evolution of our Galaxy. On September 14, 2016, the Gaia consortium published the first Gaia Data release, Gaia DR1 (Gaia Collaboration , 2016b), containing the positions and broad-band photometry for 1.143 billion objects. Given the short timespan of the measurements incorporated into this release (less than 15 months), the separation of parallaxes and proper motions was not possible. Therefore Gaia DR1 in general does not include these quantities, with the exception of a small subset of those 2 million stars already present in the Hipparcos (ESA, 1997) or Tycho2 catalogs (Høg et al., 2000). Using this data as a first epoch, proper motions and parallaxes could be disentangled, yielding the Tycho Gaia Astrometric Solution (TGAS, Michalik et al., 2015). Thus most astrometry-related projects within the astronomical community might focus on the TGAS data, as well as on preparing for the next Gaia release.

In the meantime, we present a very short-lived yet powerful astrometric catalog, adding value and scientific use cases to Gaia DR1. It provides proper motions for 583 million objects, i.e. for more than half of the objects for which Gaia DR1 only gives positions. This is achieved by combining data from the PPMXL catalog (Roeser et al., 2010) and Gaia DR1 positions. Named "HSOY" (**H**ot **S**tuff for **O**ne **Y**ear), highlighting its short-lived nature, we intend to partly fill the gap in time between the ultra-precise positions of DR1 and the ultra-precise full 5 parameter astrometry of DR2.



Fig. 1. Distribution of object counts in HSOY over the Gaia *G* magnitude(red filled circles). As comparison, the object counts for Gaia DR1 are also shown (blue open triangles).

Until HSOY will be superseded by Gaia DR2, it presents the best set of proper motions in existence in the magnitude range



Fig. 2. Mean standard errors in proper motions of the HSOY catalog north and south of $\delta = -30°$. The errors are given in bins of one magnitude centered on full Gaia G magnitudes. The symbols are defined in the legend box within the plot

fainter than TGAS to $G = 20$ mag, and is a valuable base for studies of stellar kinematics.

Sect. 2 describes the assembly of this catalog and its input data, as well as giving the overall characteristics of this catalog. In Sect. 3 we demonstrate the improvement of the precision of proper motions of HSOY with respect to current entirely ground-based values with two science case examples.

2. Presenting HSOY

2.1. Construction and stellar content of HSOY

HSOY has been constructed using the method previously used to assemble the PPMXL catalog (Roeser et al., 2010), which itself now forms one of the input datasets for HSOY. For PPMXL the input data were the 2MASS (Skrutskie et al., 2006) and USNO-B1.0 catalogs (Monet et al., 2003), for HSOY, accordingly, PPMXL and Gaia DR1. The procedure of construction, described in detail in Roeser et al. (2010), involves cross-matches between the datasets, and a weighted least-squares fit to derive positions and proper motions.

PPMXL contains about 900 million, and Gaia DR1 1.1 billion sources. Yet HSOY only contains 583,001,653 entries, i.e. about 50-60% of the object numbers of the input catalogs. Fig. 1 shows the object counts for both HSOY and Gaia DR1. Of course, HSOY can only contain objects which are in both PPMXL and Gaia DR1. Objects that did not make it into the final HSOY are very probably non-stellar objects and failed matches originating in the USNO-B1. However, the inhomogeneous sky coverage of Gaia DR1 (Gaia Collaboration , 2016b) most likely also plays a role.

On the other hand, there still is a significant fraction of entries probably not related to physical objects in HSOY. The most common form of these are spurious pairs. These may arise from observations that have not been matched in USNO-B, either from different epochs or from different plates. As long as the original USNO-B matched up two observations of the same object for each pair member and the observations had sufficient precision, they will form a close, common proper motion pair in PPMXL and will consequently be matched to the same Gaia DR1 object. Such objects (and a few other cases where two or more PPMXL objects are matched to the same Gaia DR1 object) are marked with a non-NULL clone flag (0.7% of the entire catalog). PPMXL contained about 24.5 million objects with proper motions larger than 150 mas/yr on the northern hemisphere, alone against an expectation of about 10^5 as discussed in the PPMXL paper. The procedure outlined above brings the number of high-PM objects in HSOY down to 2.5 million on the entire



Fig. 3. The upper two panels show the global variation of the r.m.s. errors in proper motion (upper panel, right ascension, middle panel, declination) in equatorial coordinates. Darker shades/colours indicate higher errors. The bottom panel shows the density of HSOY in stars per square degrees over the entire sky in galactic coordinates highlighting the overall uniformity of the catalog.

Table 1. Content of the HSOY catalog.

	Name	Unit	description
1	*ipix*	–	PPMXL object identifier
2	*comp*	–	flag indicating multiple Gaia matches to one PPMXL object
3	*raj*2000	degrees	RA at J2000.0, epoch 2000.0
4	*dej*2000	degrees	Decl. J2000.0, epoch 2000.0
5	*e_ra*	degrees	Mean error: $\alpha \cos\delta$ at mean epoch
6	*e_de*	degrees	Mean error: δ at mean epoch
7	*pmra*	deg/yr	Proper motion in $\alpha \cos\delta$
8	*pmde*	deg/yr	Proper motion in δ
9	*e_pmra*	deg/yr	Mean error in $\mu_\alpha \cos\delta$
10	*e_pmde*	deg/yr	Mean error in μ_δ
11	*epra*	yr	Mean Epoch in RA (α)
11	*epde*	yr	Mean Epoch in Dec. (δ)
13	*jmag*	mag	2MASS *J* magnitude
14	*e_jmag*	mag	error of 2MASS *J* mag.
15	*hmag*	mag	2MASS *H* magnitude
16	*e_hmag*	mag	error of 2MASS *H* mag.
17	*kmag*	mag	2MASS *K* magnitude
18	*e_kmag*	mag	error of 2MASS *K* mag.
19	*b*1*mag*	mag	*B* mag: USNO-B, 1st epoch
20	*b*2*mag*	mag	*B* mag: USNO-B, 2nd epoch
21	*r*1*mag*	mag	*R* mag: USNO-B, 1st epoch
22	*r*2*mag*	mag	*R* mag: USNO-B, 2nd epoch
23	*imag*	mag	*I* mag: USNO-B
24	*surveys*	–	Origin of USNO-B mags
25	*nobs*	–	total number of astrometric observations ($n_{\rm PPMXL}$ + 1)
26	*gaiaid*	–	Gaia unique source identifier
27	*Gmag*	mag	mean Gaia *G*-band magnitude
28	*e_Gmag*	mag	estimated error of Gaia *G*-mag
29	*clone*	–	>1 PPMXL match to Gaia object
30	*no_sc*	–	object not in SuperCOSMOS

sky ($2.5 \cdot 10^5$ in the north). Hence, there are still many spurious high PM objects in HSOY accidentally matching a (real) Gaia DR1 object at J2015. Another reduction of the spurious sources can be effected by matching PPMXL against SuperCOSMOS (Hambly et al., 2001), an independent source extraction from the plate collections underlying USNO-B at J2000. Where no such match can be found within 3″, HSOY set the *no_sc* column to 1. On the northern sky, only using objects with matches in SuperCOSMOS, only 168206 objects with $\mu > 150$ mas/yr are left, within a factor of two of the level to be expected from LPSM (Lépine & Shara, 2005). All-sky, including the very crowded fields on the southern sky, there are about $1.38 \cdot 10^6$ high-PM objects with matches in SuperCOSMOS in HSOY.

Conversely, sometimes more than one Gaia DR1 object is within one PPMXL objects' match radius. While in come cases, this may be due to true binaries already resolved by Gaia, more typically they will be due to failed observation matching in the construction of Gaia DR1 and should therefore generally be considered spurious pairs, too. They are marked with a non-NULL comp flag (1.5% of the entire catalog). In both catalogs, there are a couple of hundred sources fainter than 21 mag, see Fig. 1. These have to be considered spurious sources.

2.2. The astrometric precision of HSOY

For the positions, the overwhelming precision of Gaia DR1 results in mean epochs close to that of Gaia DR1 of 2015.0; the mean epoch of most objects in HSOY is near 2014.8. In HSOY, the positions are given for epoch J2000.0 by applying proper motions. Also, the formal precision of these positions is entirely determined by the precision of the proper motions. These are at maximum 5 mas/yr (see below), so the positional rms-errors at J2000.0 are well below 0.1 arcsec, and are not individually given in the catalog. Since for the HSOY-proper motions, PPMXL's positions are necessary, the vastly higher precision of the Gaia DR1-positions does not dominate as in the case of the mean-epoch positions in the HSOY catalog. This also means that they reflect some of the systematic errors in the PPMXL, such as the zonal errors present in all ground-based catalogs of similar type (Roeser et al., 2010). This is to be kept in mind, when using HSOY proper motions. Due to the addition of Gaia DR1 these systematics are reduced to a certain extent, but do not vanish altogether[1]. Given the much smaller positional errors of Gaia DR1, the correlations between the errors in RA and declination in Gaia DR1 can here be neglected. Generally the average formal errors for HSOY proper motions range from < 0.2 mas/yr for stars brighter than 8 mag, up to 4 or 5 mas/yr near the faint magnitude limit, see Fig. 2.

Fig. 3 exhibits much larger errors in both proper motion components at declinations south of −30°- the mean formal errors there are slightly less than double of those in the rest of the sky, as shown in Fig. 2. This is inherited from the underlying plate surveys: the first all-sky Schmidt plate surveys started in the northern hemisphere in the 1950s and were extended to the south only much later in the 1970s. Therefore the baseline for proper motions in the southern quarter of the sky is shorter by 20 years, with the corresponding consequences for the formal proper motion uncertainties. Apart from this issue the errors in proper motion over the whole sky are remarkably homogeneous, being just a little higher near the dense areas of the Milky Way. Note that we used the original PPMXL proper motions rather than the possibly more inertial ones given by (Vickers et al., 2016) since the latter are only available for objects with 2MASS photometry and hence less than half the PPMXL.

HSOY is not a dedicated photometric catalog; therefore it utilises all photometry that its input catalogs supply. From its PPMXL parent, it retains the photographic magnitudes taken from the USNO-B1 catalog and the NIR 2MASS values. Added to this is the Gaia DR1 *G*-magnitude. Therefore, for more information regarding the quality of the photometry, we refer to the original sources, i.e. Gaia DR1, USNO-B1, and 2MASS.

As for Gaia DR1 itself, the primary access mode to HSOY is the Virtual Observatory protocol TAP through the service at http://dc.g-vo.org/tap. Further access options are discussed at http:///dc.g-vo.org/hsoy (Demleitner et al., 2015). Table 1 shows the data content of HSOY.

3. The proper motions of M 4 and M 67 as science case examples

In order to demonstrate the increased capabilities of HSOY, especially with respect to earlier, entirely ground-based catalogs, e.g. PPMXL, we present the proper motion distributions in the fields of the globular cluster M 4 (NGC 6121) and the rich, old open cluster M 67 (NGC 2682). These objects are especially instructive, given their large proper motion and high stellar density.

For M 4 we downloaded a circular field with a radius of 0.5°, which was found to show both the cluster and the field stars best, from both catalogs. The field of view is shown in Fig. 4. The resulting vector point diagrams (VPD) are also shown in Fig. 4. A

[1] It would in principle be possible to reduce these errors even further by re-constructing the PPMXL itself using Gaia DR1, but this is not worthwhile on the timescale of the useful life of HSOY



Fig. 4. left panel: plot of the field with a radius of 30' taken from the HSOY catalog centered around M 4 . The center and right panels show the vector point diagrams of the M 4 region, with proper motions taken from the PPMXL (centre) and HSOY (right). The hole in the middle of the plot is caused by the strong crowding in the central part of M 4, the few points inside this hole can be considered as being spurious, which means they have to by suppressed in any kind of analysis.



Fig. 5. left panel: plot of the field with a radius of 1 degrees around M 67 taken from the HSOY catalog. The center and right panels show the vector point diagrams of the M 67 region, with proper motions taken from the PPMXL (centre) and HSOY (right).

comparison of the VPD made from the PPMXL proper motions (centre panel) with that made from HSOY data clearly shows the dramatic improvement. Although the PPMXL has significantly more stars in this field than HSOY (42,000 vs. 30,000), the M 4 proper motion peak is much more and the field peak somewhat more pronounced in the latter case.

The open cluster, M 67, one of the oldest of its kind and rather populous, is our second demonstration object. Fig. 5 shows the field and the vector point diagrams for both PPMXL (centre) and HSOY (right), this time, given the less dense environment, using a field with a radius of 1°. Again the clear improvement is seen by comparing the centre and right panels in Fig. 5. While the PPMXL only shows hints of the cluster, it clearly stands out in the VPD generated using HSOY.

Both demonstration cases, i.e. M 4 and M 67 highlight the scientific potential of this catalog. The improvement is clearly shown. There are certainly many other science cases which will profit from the existence of HSOY.

4. Outlook

In a little more than a year from now, Gaia DR2 will be released and will thus make HSOY obsolete. However, we believe that this catalog will be put to good use until then. In a way it is the final version of the second-generation ground-based astrometric catalogs, i.e., those done before or at the beginning of the CCD age, but with old photographic plates as the long time-baseline basis. On the other hand it presents a bridge to a new generation of ground-based astrometric surveys, now based on Gaia data, such as what will come out of LSST. These will go much fainter than either the current catalogs or Gaia, and will continue the tradition of space-calibrated ground-based astrometric catalogs.

Acknowledgements. S. Roeser and E. Schilbach were supported by Sonderforschungsbereich SFB 881 The Milky Way System (subprojects B5) of the German Research Foundation (DFG). It is a great pleasure to acknowledge Mark Taylor from the Astrophysics Group of the School of Physics at the University of Bristol for his wonderful work on TOPCAT, Tool for OPerations on Catalogues And Tables and STILTS, Starlink Tables Infrastructure Library Tool Set. This research has made use of the resources of CDS, Strasbourg, France. Technical and publication support was provided by GAVO under BMBF grant 05A14VHA. This work has made use of data from the European Space Agency (ESA) mission *Gaia* (`http://www.cosmos.esa.int/gaia`), processed by the *Gaia* Data Processing and Analysis Consortium (DPAC, `http://www.cosmos.esa.int/web/gaia/dpac/consortium`). Funding for the DPAC has been provided by national institutions, in particular the institutions participating in the *Gaia* Multilateral Agreement.

References

Demleitner, M., Roeser, S., Proft, S., 2015, "Hsoy Object Catalog", `http://dc.zah.uni-heidelberg.de/tableinfo/hsoy.main`
ESA 1997, ESA Special Publication, 1200
Gaia Collaboration, Brown, A. G. A., Vallenari, A., et al. 2016b, A&A, 595, A2
Gaia Collaboration, Prusti, T., de Bruijne, J. H. J., et al. 2016a, A&A, 595, A1
Hambly, N.C., MacGillivray, H.T., Read, M.A., et al. 2001, MNRAS, 326, 1279
Høg, E., Fabricius, C., Makarov, V. V., et al. 2000, A&A, 355, L27
Lépine, S., & Shara, M. M. 2005, AJ, 129, 1483
Michalik, D., Lindegren, L., & Hobbs, D. 2015, A&A, 574, A115
Monet, D. G., Levine, S. E., Canzian, B., et al. 2003, AJ, 125, 984
Roeser, S., Demleitner, M., & Schilbach, E. 2010, AJ, 139, 2440
Skrutskie, M. F., Cutri, R. M., Stiening, R., et al. 2006, AJ, 131, 1163
Vickers, J. J., Röser, S., & Grebel, E. K. 2016, AJ, 151, 99